

Marzenna Czerniak-Drożdżowicz
marzenna.czerniak-drozdzowicz@uj.edu.pl
(Jagiellonian University, Cracow)

When Gods Get Broken—the Theory and Practice of the *jīrṇoddhāra* and *navīkaraṇa* in the Pāñcarātriśa sources*

SUMMARY: The elaborate rituals accompanying the construction of a temple and the installation of its idols characteristic of Tantric traditions were meant to ensure a perfect abode and receptacle for the highest god in his earthly manifestation. Descriptions of these rituals in religious texts supplement technical prescripts included in texts on art and architecture and provide a theoretical and theological background for the temple cult. The practices enable the proper creation and then the appropriate use of the temple and its idol, guaranteed by the permanent presence of god. But in the every-day temple practice the ritual could be endangered by the fact that the temple and the idol in some situations lose their perfection. This can be caused by impurity or damage. The ideal structure can be spoilt and therefore the religious practice and ritualistic manuals have to provide practical methods of reacting to such inevitable events.

The article refers to several Pāñcarātriśa sources which in their passages concern the impurity and damages as well as the renovation and replacement of old temples and images. The actions to be undertaken in such cases are presented in the texts under the heading *jīrṇoddhāra*.

KEYWORDS: Pāñcarātriśa, temple cult, images, renovation rituals (*jīrṇoddhāra*)

Very elaborate rituals connected with the construction of a temple and the installation of an idol central to the temple cult are characteristic of

* The research on South Indian temple cult is conducted in the frame of the research grant of the Polish National Centre of Science, decision number UMO-2011/03/B/HS2/02267.

Tantric traditions, and among them the South Indian Vaiṣṇava cults of Vaikhāṇasa and Pāñcarātra. These rituals were meant to ensure a perfect abode and receptacle for the highest god in his earthly manifestation. Only by following the very detailed rules can one expect to achieve a perfect result, namely to construct the place and form which god requires and deserves. Descriptions of the particular rituals accompanying this construction found in the canonical texts of the religious traditions supplement the technical prescripts included in texts on art and architecture and provide a theoretical and theological background for the temple cult. Reading into these texts gives a better insight into the essence of the worship of god's representations in Tantric traditions, among them Pāñcarātra. As D. Smith wrote: "From the heavily-liturgical texts of the Pāñcarātrāgama one can begin to appreciate at least some of the holy enthusiasm that fired the faithful to prepare a house where the Lord in His image-form might be worshipped in appropriate dignity."¹

The elaborate, time-consuming practices enable proper creation and then appropriate use of the temple and its idol, guaranteed by the permanent presence of god. But in the every-day temple practice the ritual could be endangered by the fact that the temple and the idol in some situations lose their perfection and, consequently, also their efficiency in ensuring god's presence and providing his grace. This can be caused by impurity or damage. The impurity can be caused by a trivial, physical reason as well as by a religious deficiency.² The damage can be caused by physical destruction of some parts or the whole temple or idol. The ideal structure can be spoilt and therefore the religious

¹ D. Smith in the Foreword to the *Pāñcarātraprāsādaprasādhana*, p. XIX (Smith 1963). About Śiva's representations and their worship, see for example Davis 2000, especially chapter 4 entitled *Summoning the Lord*.

² In the history of India, foreign invasions, for example those by Muslims, were also the reasons forcing the priests and devotees to hide temple images. They were taken to safer places or buried in the ground. See for example Davis 1999, Sarma (forthcoming).

practice and ritualistic manuals have to provide practical methods of reacting to such inevitable events as impurity or damage within the temple premises.

The techniques of dealing with damage combine theoretical/theological and religious/ritualistic issues with practical problems of managing the material structures and objects. The subject is connected also with the craft of Indian artisans (architects, painters and sculptors) mastered throughout centuries and accompanying the development of the religious traditions. It reached a very high level of performance especially around the 10th century A.D. and at that time the development of the stone temple architecture and sculptures as well as metal casts and paintings of god's images were in their full bloom.

In the religious context of the Pāñcarātra one has to remember the strong belief in the real presence of god in his representations connected with the concept of the five modes of his existence—*para*, *vyūha*, *vibhava*, *antaryāmin* and *arcāvatāra*³, where the *arcāvatāra* is perceived as his real presence in the representations, enabling a very close and intimate relation between the god and his devotees. Therefore, the question of how to handle these representations becomes one of the issues often undertaken and elaborated in the Pāñcarātrika *saṃhitās*.⁴

³ These are: the highest and transcendent form of god, his emanations, his manifestations, the form of the “inner controller” present in every living creature, and the god present in his representations; see for example Czerniak-Drożdżowicz 2011, pp. 85–96, and Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (forthcoming). The concept of five modes of god's existence, and especially the last two—*antaryāmin* and *arcāvatāra*, was elaborated in the Śrīvaiṣṇava theology; see for example Narayanan 1984, Nayar 1992.

⁴ I presented some basic information concerning the installation ceremony—*pratiṣṭhā* in the article entitled “The *Pratiṣṭhā* Ceremony (Installation of an Idol) in Some Pāñcarātrika Sources”, in: CEENIS Current Research Series vol. 1. Edited by Danuta Stasik and Anna Trynkowska. Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, Warsaw 2013. More elaborate remarks on the topic were presented in the paper entitled “At the crossroad of art and religion—image consecration in the Pāñcarātrika sources”, delivered at the International

The actions to be undertaken in the case of damages are presented in the texts under the heading *jīrṇoddhāra*, which is often translated as “reconstruction of the damaged”. Sometimes also the term *navīkaraṇa* is used, which literally means “making anew/renovation”, however, it is used less frequently. In the Pāñcarātrika sources *navīkaraṇa* is not used as a noun, though in the *Īśvarasaṃhitā* and the *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā* the expressions *navīkṛtya* and *navam kṛtvā* can be found (*Īśvarasaṃhitā* 19.94—*navam kṛtvā*; 19.158, 19.159, 19.172 and 19.179—*navīkṛtya*); *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā* 19.389—*navīkṛtya*; 19.454 *navam kṛtvā*).⁵

The term *jīrṇoddhāra* poses some terminological problems and apart from “reconstruction of the damaged” it could also be translated as “removal/extraction of the old/damaged”. This terminological problem was observed for example by A. von Rospatt, who bases his deliberations mostly on the Buddhist sources and presents them, for example, in his article concerning Svayambhu *caitya*’s renovation. He proposes the translation “the removal of what has become marred”.⁶ A similar translation is provided by the *Tāntrikābhidhānakōśa*: “removal of a [cult-image] that is old and used”.⁷ Though such is a direct translation from Sanskrit, nevertheless, the term was understood not only as the removal of the old but also as the whole process of renovation or even replacement of the old one by the new one. The removal, as also von Rospatt observes, could mean the actual extraction of the idol or for

Seminar *Consecration Rituals in South Asia*, Department of Archaeology and Religious Studies, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway, 18.10.2012–20.10.2012, (forthcoming).

⁵ Some information concerning faults in the images and the ways of treating them, together with several details concerning installation ceremony can be also found in the *Paṣṣkarasaṃhitā* chapter 38.

⁶ Rospatt 2013. I am very grateful to the Author for providing me with his text and for his very useful remarks concerning this problem (personal communications, Oslo 2011).

⁷ TAK vol. II, p. 274.

example the *yaṣṭi* pole from the core of the *caitya*, even with the help of bulls, which by pulling it enable this technically complicated task.⁸

The Pāñcarātrika *saṃhitās* do not give clear and direct information how the term should be understood, though for example the comparison of the process of renovation to the process of assuming a new body by a soul would suggest both the removal or abandoning of the old shape and then acquiring the new one.⁹ The term appears usually in the context suggesting not only removal but also renovation or replacement, as can be found for example in the *Īśvarasaṃhitā*:

“I will explain the rule of removal/renovation of the old, listen o Wise ones.
For the self-manifesting and other images, if the main limb or minor limb
is broken, there should be uniting/repair, but never abandoning.”¹⁰

Therefore, considering also the fact that the description of the *jīrṇoddhāra* is not limited to the removal, but usually followed by the description of the repair or replacement, we would be tempted to understand the term in a much broader sense than just literal, and we take it as removal and renovation or replacement.

Descriptions of the renovation of idols and temples can be also found in Puranic texts, such as for example the *Agnipurāṇa* chapter 67, as well as in the literature concerning handicrafts and architecture, for example the *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇa*¹¹; the *Mayamata*, connected with the Śaivasiddhānta tradition and South India¹²; or the *Śilparatna*,

⁸ Similar procedure with the usage of bulls is, under the heading of *bimboddhāra*, mentioned also by S.A.S. Sarma (Sarma forthcoming), who refers to the Kerala context.

⁹ *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* 24.3; see also p.17.

¹⁰ *Īśvarasaṃhitā* 19.50cd-51:

jīrṇoddhāravidhiṃ vakṣye śṛṇudhvam munisattamāḥ || 19.50

svayaṃvyaktāḍibimbānām mahāṅge vāhyupāṅgake |

bhagne sandhānam <saṃdhānam> eva syāt tyāgas tu na kadācana || 19.51

¹¹ Sanskrit text in Banerjea 2002, Appendix B II.

¹² For example the *Mayamata* chapter 35; English translation see Dagens 1995.

ascribed to Śrīkumāra (16th AD). The *Śilparatna* reads: “(...) when an image is slightly damaged, it should never be discarded; but when its arms, hands, feet and legs are severed, when it is broken, split up or nine *yava* portion of it is gone or when it gets disfigured, it is usually to be discarded. If its fingers, etc., are cut up (or broken) the sages recommend binding (repairing) them”.¹³ All the repairs of the damage inside the temple were also regulated by strict rules.

The causes of damage

In relevant texts several reasons causing damage to temples and idols are given, for example¹⁴: cavity and loss of bricks (*iṣṭakākṣepa*, *iṣṭakāvipyāsa*), damage to bricks and stones in temple walls, cracking in plaster (*sudhāspṛṣṭa*), leakage of water (*jalasaṃsrāva*), emergence of fungus (*kavakodbhava*), accumulation of water after bathing the idols (*abhiṣekāmbusaṅkaṭa*), damage to the *prastara* roof, destruction of the door or its frame known as *kavāṭa* and *dvāra*, emergence and an attack of flies or wild bees known as *mahāmākṣika*, emergence of anthill (*valmīka*), decrease of the ground level (*sthalavibhrama*). The damage caused by fire, water, also by animals such as elephants and by thieves and arrogant people shall be repaired immediately. A clap of thunder (*aśani*) or the appearance of insects may cause the damage. Insects and animals not only could cause damage

¹³ In Banerjea's translation; Banerjea 2002. *Śilparatna*, part II, p. 209, in Banerjea 2002, p. 571:

doṣe laghutare bimbaṃ naiva tyājyaṃ kadācana |
bāhucchede karacchede pādacchede tathaiva ca ||
tathaiva sphuṭite bhinne yasmin navayave gate |
vairūpyaṃ jāyate yasya tat tyājyaṃ prāyaśo bhavet ||
aṅgulyādiparicchede bandhanaṃ śasyate [corr.; sas'yate ed.] budhaiḥ

¹⁴ See Narasimhan 2005, pp. 202–216. He, basing his research on several sources, in the footnotes 1–15 refers to the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava texts: *Kriyādhikāra*, *Khilādhikāra*, *Kāraṇāgama*, *Vimānārcanākālpa*, *Nāradya-saṃhitā*, *Pādmasaṃhitā* and *Viṣvakṣenasaṃhitā*.

to the temples and images, but their blood or excrement could also pollute them.

Pāñcarātrika texts enumerate many reasons causing damage to the temple, for example the *Īśvarasamhitā* speaks about a cleft of the ground (*kṣmābheda*) and flooding with water (*jalavega*)¹⁵; the *Nārādīyasamhitā* speaks about fractures in the major and minor limbs of the idol, and damage caused by worms and fire. The idol is impure when it is destroyed, hollowed or broken, or stolen by thieves; it is spoiled and becomes polluted by impure substances such as purulent matter (pus, discharge from wounds, etc.), excrement, blood, alcohol; it also could be cracked, unfixed or worn out due to the passage of time; the same applies also to the temples.¹⁶

¹⁵ *Īśvarasamhitā* 19.114:

*kṣmābhedajalavegādyaḥ patitaṃ bhagavadgrhaṃ |
prāgbimbasaḥ hitaṃ tasmād deśād anyatra kalpayet || 19.114*

“The house of Bhagavān destructed by the cleft of the ground, flooding with water and others, [while] previously provided with an image, one, [having removed it] from this place, should create/establish [it] in an other place.”

¹⁶ *Nārādīyasamhitā* 17.10cd-13:

*aṅgopāṅgādibhinne tu kṣmivahnyādīdūṣite || 17.10
naṣṭe sasūṣire bhagne corair apahrte 'pi ca |
pūyaviṇmūtrarudhiraiḥ surayā cāpi dūṣite || 17.11
sphuṭite calite bimbe jīrṇe kālavaśād dvija |
doṣair anyais tathā duṣṭe nadīvegādibhis tu vā || 17.12
pīṭhe bhinne tathā jīrṇe devyor vā jīrṇayor api |
prāsāde 'śaninā bhagne jīrṇe kālavaśād yadi || 17.13*

“If [the major] and minor limbs are broken, destroyed by worms, fire etc., if it [the idol] is destroyed, has holes, is broken or if it is stolen by thieves, spoiled by a discharge from a wound, by feces and urine or blood, as well as alcohol, cracked, unstable, or the idol is worn out with the passage of time, O Twice-born, as well as spoiled by the other faults or by the flooding with water etc.,

The *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā*, dedicating some parts, for example of chapters 36 and 38, to the topic of images and their treatment, points out that moving the images out of their places after installation, except in the case of damage, causes unrest (*jīrṇadoṣaṃ vinā caiva cālanam yad aśāntikam*).¹⁷ It also reads that the damage caused for example by the landslide or earthquake brings the destruction of the king, but if the *mantras* are re-established after the renovation of the image, the prosperity regenerates (*tadastamitamāntrāṇāṃ bhūyaḥ saṃsthā-pane kṛte / udayaṃ jāyate*).¹⁸

The *Pādmasaṃhitā* also mentions several reasons for renovation and for the need of purification caused by the pollution in the temple. The purification can be accomplished by the ritual of sprinkling with water and it applies for example to the cases of polluting by impure

if the pedestal is broken or old, or if both goddesses* are worn out, in the temple destroyed by a thunder and worn out with the passage of time (...)."

* Probably goddesses Bhūdevī and Śrīdevī, accompanying the Viṣṇu's idol, are meant here.

¹⁷ *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 36.431–432:

*aparair aṣṭabhedasthair varṇair vā brāhmaṇādikaḥ |
prasthāpitās ca vidhivat pratimā yā nṛpottamaiḥ || 36. 431
pratibimbamayīm vyaktim svayam evācyutena vā |
jīrṇadoṣaṃ vinā caiva cālanam yad aśāntikam || 36.432*

"The image which is installed according to the rules by others who belong to the eight divisions [members of other 8 divisions (?)] or *varṇas* such as Brahmins and others, or by eminent kings, or [established] by Acyuta as a self-manifested representation, its moving/displacement, if [it is] without a fault of damage, causes unrest."

¹⁸ *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 36. 433–435:

*kṣatam utpātapūrvais tu doṣais tu nṛpanāśakṛt |
tadastamitamāntrāṇāṃ bhūyaḥ saṃsthāpane kṛte || 36.433
udayaṃ jāyate śaśvacchāntaye kintu pauṣkara |
deśikendrair yathādhātāḥ sūryendvanalalasannibhāḥ || 36.434*

substances, animals etc.: “(...) in the case of polluting the temple by the contacts with unclean fluids, blood, excrements, or of living or dead dogs, jackals or dead corpses and if the idol [would be touched by them] (...)” (*viṇmūtrarudhirāpeyasparśadoṣe ca mandire // janane maraṇe caiva śvasrgālasavādibhiḥ / sprṣṭe ca bimbe* (...)—PādS cp 17.44ab–45abc).

Among those whose touch and presence in the temple is polluting, the *Īśvarasaṃhitā* mentions people degraded from their social class (*patita*), sinners (*pātakīn*), the leprous (*kuṣṭhīn*), epileptic (*apasmāra*), ill (*rogavan*), one-eyed (*kāṇa*), those suffering from eye illness called *bandha*¹⁹ (*bāndha*), the dumb (*mūka*), deaf (*badhira*), limbless (*aṅgaḥīna*), the one not object to contact with unmarried women or those married to other men (*parastrīgamanāsakta*), an adulterine (*kuṇḍa*), a widow's bastard (*golaka*), menstruating women (*rajasvalā*), one of the lowest caste (*antyaja*); also the touch of Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra requires bathing of the idol.²⁰

praviśanti ca mantresāḥ praṇavadhvanisādhitāḥ |
karṣayanti vibhūtiṃ svām kiñcitkālāntareṇa tu ||

“The damage [caused] by the faults being the results of the calamity [such as, for example, an earthquake] brings the destruction of the king.

If there is the re-installation of the *mantras* of this damaged [image], the perpetual prosperity regenerates. But during the pacification,

O Pauṣkara,

properly evoked by the teachers and resembling the sun, moon and fire,

and accomplished by the sound of *praṇava*, these lords of *mantras* enter [the images],

and [they] draw/infuse [their] own power [into them] after some time.”

¹⁹ A disease which prevents the eyelids from closing.

²⁰ *Īśvarasaṃhitā* 19.138-142:

patitah pātakī vāpi kuṣṭhyapasmārarogavān |
kāṇo bāndhaś ca mūko vā badhiro vāṅgaḥīnakaḥ || 19.138
parastrīgamanāsaktaḥ kuṇḍo vā golako 'pi vā |
rajasvalāntyajādyaiś ca saṃsprṣṭo gardabhādibhiḥ || 19.139

Polluting requiring purification and caused by an improper or impure person (thief, Śūdra, etc.) is also mentioned in the *Pārameśvara-saṃhitā*;²¹ the *Viṣvakṣeṇasaṃhitā* mentions also Caṇḍālas, degraded, menstruating women, outcastes, carpenters and others as causing, with their touch, pollution which require purification.²²

spṛśec ced bhagavadbimbam adhamottamamārgataḥ |
saṃsṛāpya devaṃ vidhivacchāntihomaṃ tathācaret || 19.140
etaiḥ praviṣṭe dhāmāntaḥ kuryād adhamamadhyaṃam |
snapanam devadevasya śāntihomaṃ tathācaret || 19.141
kṣatrain viśyais tathā śūdrais tattatstrībhis tu vā dvijāḥ |
bimbe spṛṣṭe kramāt kuryāt snapanam tv adhamottamam || 19.142

“If wicked/degraded, sinner or leprous, epileptic and ill, one-eyed, suffering from *bandha* eye disease, dumb, deaf or limbless, addicted to going to women who are unmarried or married to another man, an adulterine [or a son of the man other than her husband], or a widow’s bastard, the one touched by a menstruating woman, or touched by the one of the lowest cast or by the [cow-dung] beetle etc., touches the image of God, he [the priest], according to the method which is the supreme among inferior having withdrawn the God according to the rule, should undertake *śāntihoma*.

If they [the people mentioned above] enter the abode, one should perform the middle of the lowest [grade of the] bathing of the God of gods and then he should perform *śāntihoma*. By Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras or their women, O, Brahmins if the idol is touched, in due order one should do the bathing but the highest of the lowest”

²¹ *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā* 19.142:

kṣatrain viśyais tathā śūdrais tattatstrībhis tu vā dvijāḥ |
bimbe spṛṣṭe kramāt kuryāt snapanam tv adhamottamam || 19.142

“By Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras or their women, O Brahmins, if the idol is touched, in due order one should do the highest of the lowest bathing.”

²² *Viṣvakṣeṇasaṃhitā* 36.143-144:

caṇḍālapatitodakyaṇiśādyai(-dai?)s takṣakādikaḥ |
lobhād vā yadi vā mohāt sparśanam cen munīśvara || 36.143

Among animals causing pollution in the temple premises and of the idol itself, the *Pārameśvarasamhitā* enumerates cats (*bidāla*), birds (*pakṣin*), for example crows (*kāka*), wild cock (*kumkkuṭa=kukkuṭa?*), vulture (*grdhra*), also firefly (*khadyota*), wasp (*bhṛṅga*), bee (*makṣikā*), but not an ant (*pipīlika*) or the like; among the polluting substances it mentions semen (*retas*), blood (*rudhira*), excrement (*viṇmūtra*), undrinkable liquids (?) (*apeya*) and meat (*māṃsa*).²³

Different treatment of various types of idols and temples

The procedures of renovation, as presented in the Pāñcarātrika literature, differ according to various factors. Firstly, the texts differentiate the images and temples according to the way they came into existence, namely there is a special category of self-appearing, self-manifesting temples and images—*svayaṃvyakta/svavyakta/svayaṃbhava*, which are especially valuable. The texts suggest special treatment of them, however, since they often add *ādi* in the compound (for example *svayaṃvyaktādi*), it would suggest that the rules refer not only to the *svayaṃvyakta* idols but also to other kinds of them. When one considers several passages from different Pāñcarātrika sources, one can see that sometimes they are not very clear in this matter, for example the *Īśvarasamhitā* reads:

“Listen, O Best of the wise ones, I will tell [you] about the rule of renovation for self-manifesting [idols] as well as those created by gods, by *siddhas*, by *ṛṣis* and by men.

For the images which are self-manifested and others, in the case of a big damage or a small one,

prāsādaprokṣaṇenaiva prāsādam śuddhyate 'tra vai |
atha vā muniśārdūla pañcagavyaṃ samānayet || 36.144

The *Īśvarasamhitā* mentions those who cause the pollution in verses 19.155cd–157ab.

²³ *Pārameśvarasamhitā* 19.363–369. Similarly, in passage 19.409–412 it orders also purification of the ground in the case of pollution caused by dead animals in the temple premises.

repairing of the fracture should be done, but they should never be abandoned.

Even if there is no possibility of repairing, it should not be thrown away, O best of Munis.

The same as [the broken parts of] a *sāligrāma* stone image, split or broken [and] very much destroyed or slightly destroyed, with a golden slab/plate/strip [to make it] stronger, should be joined/unite/fixed; in such a way [one should proceed in the case of] self-manifested and others.”²⁴

And further the same text reads:

“In the case of the self-manifested and others or even those created by gods or *siddhas*
the idol, temple, courtyard, gate, door, pavillion,
pedestal, kitchen or even the treasure-house
provided with [proper] features or even deprived of them [without them],
if they are old, one should re-create [them] in accordance with the previous shape.

In doing otherwise, O Brahmins, there would be a great offence.”²⁵

In another passage the *Īśvarasamhitā* reads that at least purifying sprinkling is compulsory in the case of the self-manifested, and other, idols:

“Having renovated, according to the rules, the idol painted or made of clay,
one should re-install it in the case of the self-manifested and others.
Even without renovating, for the painted idol and others, like previously,

²⁴ *Īśvarasamhitā* 19.50-53:

svayaṃvyakte tathā divye saiddhe cārṣādyamānuṣe |
jīṇoddhāraviddhiṃ vakṣye śṛṇudhvam munisattamāḥ || 19.50
svayaṃvyaktātibimbānām mahāṅge vā hy upāṅgake |
bhagne sandhānam <saṃdhānam> eva syāt tyāgas tu na kadācana || 19.51
sandhānāyogyam <saṃdhānāyogyam> api tan na tyājyaṃ munisattamāḥ |
sāligrāmaśālābimbam <sāligrāmaśālābimbam> bhinnam bhagnam bṛhat
kṣatam || 19.52
alpakṣatam ca sauvarṇaiḥ paṭṭair dṛḍhatarāṃ yathā |
bandhayec ca tathaivaiṣu svayaṃvyaktādikēṣv api || 19.53

²⁵ *Īśvarasamhitā* 19.106cd-109ab:

svayaṃvyaktādike vāpi devasiddhādikalpīte || 19.106
bimbe vimāne prākāre gopure dvāri maṇṭape |

one should perform sprinkling etc.; by this one purifies [it]”²⁶

Similarly the *Nāradyasamhitā* in the chapter 15 reads that the re-installation of the self-manifested and the *muni*-made idols is not needed:

“One should not perform consecration (*pratiṣṭhāpana*)²⁷ for the [idol] of the *svayamvyakta* type [and ?] the one made by *munis*.
If the idol and the temple are broken or old, one should not dispose/get rid of it.”²⁸

The *Īśvarasamhitā* in chapter 19 refers also to damaged temples:

“The renovation of the self-manifested abodes and others will be presented [now].
If there is a fracture in one place in the temple etc., the gods which are established there
should not be invoked into another place; one worships them right there.

pīṭhe vā pacanāvāse koṣāgārādike 'pi vā || 19.107
lakṣaṇair anvite vāpi lakṣaṇair ujjhite 'pi vā |
jirṇe punas tathā kuryāt pūrvarūpānusārataḥ || 19.108
anyathā karaṇe viprāḥ pratyavāyo mahān bhavet |

²⁶ *Īśvarasamhitā* 19.158-159:

citraṃṣṇmayabimbam tu navīkṛtya yathāvidhi |
punaḥ pratiṣṭhām kurvīta svayamvyaktādikeṣu ca || 19.158
citrabimbādikaṃ cāpi na navīkṛtya pūrvavat |
saṃprokṣaṇādikaṃ kuryāt tat tu tenaiva śudhyati || 19.159

Īśvarasamhitā 19.54–19.83 refers also to the renovation according to the material the idol was made of.

²⁷ Here probably one kind of installation is meant, namely the one for a movable idol, which is mentioned for example in the *Viṣṇusamhitā*: *sthāpan-āsthāpanā caiva tathā saṃsthāpanā punaḥ / prasthāpanā ca pañcoktāḥ prati-ṣṭhāpanayā saha || 15.2 sthītāsānaśayānānām yānagasya calasya ca / yā kriyā pañcadhā proktā sā pratiṣṭheti kīrtitā || 15.3*—“*sthāpanā*, *āsthāpanā* as well as *saṃsthāpanā* and *prasthāpanā*—five are named together with *pratiṣṭhāpanā*. For the standing, sitting, laying, running on the cart and movable [idol], the ceremony is fivefold—it is known as *pratiṣṭhā*.”

²⁸ *Nāradyasamhitā* 15.254:

na pratiṣṭhāpanam kuryāt svavyakte munikalpite |
bhinne jirṇe 'thavā bimbe prāsāde vā na tat tyajet || 15.254

Having united the one-break damage, he should perform sprinkling,
O Brahmins.

In the case of the temple destroyed everywhere, the gods residing there
should be worshipped, having been invoked onto the pedestal of the main
idol.

Even with the old bricks etc. and with the things of this kind/similar
with the new ones and even bigger { ? -gilita } should [one] then create
the temple.

Of which material was the old *vimāna* and with which features it was
provided,

then [the *vimāna*] of that kind one should [re-]create, and not otherwise.

Having installed according to the rules a re-created *vimāna* and others,
one should perform sprinkling etc. for the God, O Munis.²⁹

In the case of damages to the pedestal, the *Śrīpraśnasamhitā*
(49.439cd–440ab), also using the compound with *ādi*, suggests dis-
posal, not renovation:

“For the idols of the *svayaṃvyakta* and other [kinds], if there is a break
in the pedestal,
having abandoned the broken pedestal, one should then prepare another one.”³⁰

²⁹ *Īśvarasamhitā* 19.100cd–106ab:

svayaṃvyaktādike dhāmni jīrnoddhāras tu vakṣyate || 19.100
prāsādāder ekadeśabhaṅgaś cet tatra samsthitāḥ |
devās tv anyatra nodvāhyāḥ pūjayann eva tatra tāḥ || 19.101
*bhagnaikadeśaṃ sandhāya <samdhāya> kuryāt samprokṣaṇaṃ <sam-
prokṣaṇaṃ> dvijāḥ* |
prāsāde sarvato bhagne prāsādasthās tu devatāḥ || 19.102
mūlabimbasya pīṭhe tu samāvāhya samarcayan |
prāktanair eveṣṭakādyaḥ tatsujātīyavastubhiḥ || 19.103
nūtanaiś cāpi gilītaiḥ prāsādaṃ kalpayet punaḥ |
pūrvaṃ vimānaṃ yaddravyaṃ yādṛglakṣaṇasamyutam || 19.104
tādṛg eva punaḥ kuryān na kuryād anyathā punaḥ |
punaḥ kṛtaṃ vimānādyam pratiṣṭhāpya yathāvidhi || 19.105
samprokṣaṇādikaṃ kuryād devasya munipuṅgavāḥ | 19.106 ab

³⁰ *Śrīpraśnasamhitā* 49.439cd–440ab:

svayaṃvyaktādibimbānāṃ pīṭhabhaṅgo bhaved yadi || 49.439
bhagnaṃ pīṭhaṃ parityajya punar anyam prakalpayet |

As for the damages of the self-manifested idols themselves, the *Śrī-praśnasamhitā* recommends sprinkling in the case of renovating of the old one and installation in the case of an exchange for a new idol:

“If there is uniting/repair of the man-made or self-manifested idol, having united [it], one should perform sprinkling, but there is no other rule. If there is a new one, one should perform the installation of the whole idol. The renovation of the temple, pavilion and others is [also] explained here.”³¹

The *Nāradyasamhitā*, though, says that first of all there is no need for the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of the *svavyakta* idol and the one established by the *munis*, but also there is no possibility of getting rid of it, if broken.³² Further on it reads that there are three different rules concerning broken images of different kinds, namely *mānuṣa*, *aṣṭaka* and *svavyakta*.³³ Nevertheless, further on, the text does not develop this idea and, what is more, suggests that the procedures for different types of images are not different, and reads:

“In this way one should proceed if the temple created by the *siddhas* is damaged.
In the same way if the self-manifested idol or temple, O Twice-born, is damaged, one should proceed; and if the temple and others

³¹ *Śrīpraśnasamhitā* 49.443cd-444ab:

*mānuṣe vā svayamvyakte samdhānam vighrahe yadi || 49.443
samdhāya prokṣaṇam kāryam na ca tv anyo vidhir bhavet |
nūtanam cet pratiṣṭhaiva sarvabimbasya kārayet || 49.444
prāsādamaṇḍapādīnām jīrnoddhāra ihocyate |*

³² *Nāradyasamhitā* 15.254:

*na pratiṣṭhāpanam kuryāt svavyakte munikalpite |
bhinne jīrṇe 'thavā bimbe prāsāde vā na tat tyajet || 15.254*

³³ *Nāradyasamhitā* 17.2cd-3ab:

*vidhānam jīrṇabimbānām trividham parikīrtitam || 17.2
mānuṣam cāṣṭakam caiva svavyaktam iti bhedataḥ |*

“The rule [concerning] broken images is described as threefold: for a man-made [type], for a *ṛṣi*-made [type] and for a self-manifested one (*svavyakta*) separately.”

[are damaged], no otherwise, O Eminent.³³⁴

Therefore, as can be seen from the quotations above, Pāñcarātrika texts are not always consistent and clear on this issue, though the tendency of distinguishing the self-manifested idols and temples as better than others and, in consequence, requiring special treatment, is to be seen.

Renovation procedures — material repair *versus* ritualistic procedures

Renovation of the temples and images, especially of the main ones (*mūlamūrti/mūlavigraha/mūlabera*), is a complicated process, which requires not only material repair but also particular ritualistic procedures, among them those enabling temporary removal of the god, or rather his potencies, from the temple or from the idol into another place.³⁵ Therefore, one of the characteristic ceremonies is that of transferring divine potencies into the vessels of water called *kumbha*. As the *Īśvarasaṃhitā* reads, the potency, if the period of repair is short, could be removed into a vessel, but if it takes longer, the construction of a provisional pavilion and image is needed.³⁶ After the renovation,

³⁴ *Nārādīyasaṃhitā* 17.79-80ab:

evam jīrṇavimāne tu saṃskuryāt siddhanirmite |
evam eva svayaṃ vyakte bimbe vāyatane dvija || 17.79
jīrṇe kuryād vimānādaṃ nānyathā dvijapuṅgava |

³⁵ S.A.S. Sarma, presenting the process of renovation in the Keralan context, distinguishes between its several elements, for example *jīvodvāsana*—“extracting the life from the idol”, *bimboddhāra*—“uninstalling the damaged idol from its pedestal”, *jīvāvāhana*—invoking the potencies back to the idol, etc.; see Sarma (forthcoming).

³⁶ *Īśvarasaṃhitā* 19.26cd-29ab:

jīrṇabimbagaṭaṃ śaktiṃ kumbhe tv āvāhya deśikaḥ || 19.26
kurvaṇ abhyarcanaṃ tatra bimbasaṃdhānaṃ <bimbasaṃdhānaṃ> ācāret |
māsād arvāksaṃdhāne kumbhe śaktiṃ samarcayet || 19.27
tadūrdhvaṃ dvādaśābdāntaṃ [em.; dvādaśābhāntaṃ ed.] saṃdhāna-
vilambane |

the god's potency goes back to the temple and image. This is executed when the priests pour water from these vessels (*kumbhābhiṣeka*) over the image or, in case of renovation of the temple, climb the temple tower and pour down water.

Abhiṣeka is one of the most spectacular rituals performed in the temples. This rite, referring to the Vedic times, when sprinkling was also an important element of the ritual,³⁷ sometimes has another function and is interpreted differently as a rite adding potency to the images which during long service are liable to impurity and loss of power. It applies especially to the processional idols, which, in addition, leave the temple premises and can face unpredictable events causing impurity, but it also applies to the main, permanent idol, which is visited by so many worshippers that it is difficult to control them fully, therefore among them improper or unauthorized persons could appear, jeopardizing the purity of the place.³⁸

Several Pāñcarātrika texts dedicate whole separate chapters or longer passages to the topic of renovation, for example the *Viṣva-ksenasaṃhitā* (chapter 36 entitled *jīrṇoddhāravidhi*—"the rule[concerning] renovation"), the *Pādmasaṃhitā* (*caryāpāda* chapter 17 entitled

*kṛtvā bālagṛhaṃ tatra bālabimbam <bālabimbam> yathāvidhi || 19.28
saṃsthāpya tatra tacchaktiṃ samāvāhya samarcayet |*

"The teacher, having invoked into the vessel the potency contained in the damaged image,
doing worship there should undertake the repair of the idol.
If the repair takes place within one month, he should worship the potency in the vessel.

If it is longer and ends within 12 years [or] in case of a delay in repair, having prepared a provisional pavilion and a provisional idol there, according to the rules, having installed [it] and having invoked this potency, there he should worship it."

³⁷ See for example Tsuchiyama 2005.

³⁸ For the question of the divine presence in his representations and the question of "renovation" of the divine potency in the Śaiva tradition one can consult for example Fuller 2004 and Davis 2000.

jīrṇoddhārasamprokṣaṇavidhi—“the rule concerning renovation and consecration [sprinkling]”), the *Viṣṇusamhitā* (chapter 24), the *Īśvara-samhitā* (in chapter 19; especially verses 1–180), the *Nāradyasamhitā* (chapter 17 entitled *jīrṇāsamskāraavidhi*—“the rule [concerning] the ritual of renovation”), the *Pārameśvarasamhitā* (longer passages in the chapters 15.915–957 and 19.350–520), the *Śrīpraśnasamhitā* (chapter 49.406–489) and the *Viśvāmitrasamhitā* (chapter 23 entitled *jīrṇoddhāraavidhi*).

The *Viṣvakṣenasamhitā* in chapter 36 (*jīrṇoddhāraavidhi*) contains elaborate passage concerning renovation of temples and idols, but also comprises many additional notes about maintaining purity and holiness in the god’s abodes as well as about the proper executors of the ritualistic activities:

“Let him undertake the renovation of the damaged [idols] together with a skilful artisan.

Otherwise, due to ignorance, he will cause damage to the village, loss of property, destruction of the place³⁹—there is no doubt about it.

Therefore, one should firstly remove the Great Hari, who resides in the temple, from the image according to the rule

and, therefore, one should attentively commence the withdrawal of potency (*śakti*).

In this way enshrining the highest divinity of the temple in the provisional/ alternate pavilion⁴⁰, in the surroundings of the temple (*prākāra*),

or in the pavilions of the attending deities (*parivāra*) in the outer surroundings, in such a way, according to the described method one should perform preliminary ceremony (*adhivāsana*).⁴¹

In this way the shortly described renovation of the damaged [idols and temples] should be performed.

³⁹ This could mean destruction of the place of living, as well as the temple.

⁴⁰ Literally “pavilion of removal”. It is, possibly, equivalent of the *bālālaya*, the provisional temple pavilion which replaces the actual sanctuary. For *bālālaya* see also footnote 3, p. 44 in the D. Smith’s edition of the *Pāñcarātraprāsāda-prasādhana*. In other contexts the term could be also understood differently and Smith (*Pāñcarātraprāsādaprasādhana* edition, footnote 36 pp. 158–159) mentions that the term *vinodamaṇḍapa* could also mean “pleasure-recreation hall”.

⁴¹ A ritual taking place the day before the actual ceremony and preparing for its proper performance. See for example TAK vol. I.

Now I will present major rules concerning renovation of damages [and the role] of a teacher, founder and master in craft,⁴² O great wise man.⁴³

One of the crucial elements of the forthcoming process of renovation is the proper treatment of the old idol.⁴⁴ The potency of the idol has to be secured and to enable it some preliminary acts are needed, such as preparation of a provisional place, a temporary abode for performing the ritual (*vinodamaṇḍapa*=*bālālaya*), providing the proper place for the withdrawal of potency from the idol (or temple) usually into

⁴² The term *takṣa* applies mainly to the work in wood and stone.

⁴³ *Viṣvaksenasamhitā* 36.41–47:

evam uktaparakāreṇa śaktim udvāsya nārada |
jīrṇoddhāraṃ tataḥ kuryāt śilpinā kuśalena tu || 36.41
anyathā kurute mohāt grāmanāśo dhanakṣayaḥ |
sthānanāśo bhavet tatra sambhaven nātra saṃśayaḥ || 36.42
tasmāt sarvaprayatnena vimānasthaṃ harim param |
udvāsya mahābere kramāt pūrvaṃ yathāvidhi || 36.43
tasmāt sarvaprayatnena śaktyudvāsanam ārabhet |
mārgeṇaikena saṃyojya prāsādasyādhidaivatam || 36.44
vinodamaṇḍapaṃ caiva vapraprākārake tathā |
parivārālayādyeṣu bahihprākārake tathā || 36.45
evam uktaparakāreṇa kārayed adhivāsanam |
evam saṃkṣepataḥ proktaṃ jīrṇoddhāraṃ athārabhet || 36.46
ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi jīrṇoddhāraavidhiṃ param |
ācāryaṃ yajamānaṃ ca takṣācāryaṃ mahāmune || 36.47

⁴⁴ An interesting example of the treatment of an old main image of god is connected with the Adi Varadarāja image from the Varadarāja temple in Kāñcīpuram. It was made of wood from Atti tree (*Ficus Glomerata*) and thus was called Atti Varadar or Ādi Atti Varadar. In about the 15th century A.D. it was replaced or rather displaced into the tank, while a new one, made of stone, replaced it in the temple. The old image is therefore still kept in the temple in its holy tank and is removed once in 40 years. On this occasion a ceremony called *maṇḍala ārādhana* is conducted; see, for example, Raman 1975. I would like to thank Prof. Ute Hüsken for drawing my attention to this special treatment of the old image and for the information that this particular old *mūrti* is considered by the followers as a very powerful and effective form of god.

a vessel, in which it will be safely kept untill the moment of the re-installation of the idol.

Afterwards the *Viṣvakṣenasamhitā* gives a relatively thorough description of the details concerning the reparation of idols with different damage and made of different types of material:

“If a clay idol is damaged, [its wooden or metal] frame (*śūla*),⁴⁵ clay, cloth or cord⁴⁶, they should be recreated from clay or one should order to make them of stone. If a stone image is damaged [its parts should be recreated] with metal or stone. If an image of jewels is damaged [it should be recreated] with gold or silver. [Images] of wood, clay, stone, metal/iron and others, golden and made of jewels in [this] order are considered better and better, beginning from the first one. [Images] of gold and jewels by some are considered equal, others as equal [consider images] of stone and metal, O Divine Muni. Golden, silver, made of copper are the same, O Nārada. One should order to create processional (*utsava*) images and others, knowing that they are called metal ones. If he [renovates them] according to the wish of the founder, [he creates them] according [their, namely founders’] wealth. And then, O Best of *munis*, he does not use lead or iron.”⁴⁷

⁴⁵ The sculptures have inside it a kind of supporting core or frame, which can be made of wood or metal. The description of the technique of making idols can be found for example in Sthapati 2002, pp. 223–232.

⁴⁶ Cloth and cords should be wrapped around the core-frame.

⁴⁷ *Viṣvakṣenasamhitā* 36.48–53:

mṛṇmayapratimājīrṇe śūlamṛtapaṭarajjavah |
punas tu mṛṇmayāḥ kāryā śilayā vāpi kārayet || 36.48
śailajapratimājīrṇe lohajāḥ śailajās tathā |
ratnajapratimājīrṇe sauvarṇaṁ vāpi rājatam || 36.49
dārumṛcchailohādyā rukmaratnādikāḥ kramāt |
uttamā iti vijñeyā uttarottaram agrataḥ || 36.50
rukmaṁ ratnaṁ samānaṁ ca kecid āhur manīṣinaḥ |
śilālohaṁ ca sadṛśaṁ devaṛṣe iti kecana || 36.51
hātakaṁ rajataṁ tāmraṁ samānaṁ iti nārada |
lohaśabdena samjñātvā kārayed utsavādikam || 36.52
yajamānasya vāñchā [corr.; vācchā ed.] cet yathāvivittānūsārataḥ (!) |
asmin munivaraśreṣṭha trapukaṁ cāyasaṁ vinā || 36.53

In addition, in a further passage, the *Viṣvaksenasamhitā* describes the features needed for a Brahmin to be entitled to perform rites in the temple, among them the installation. Here, apart from knowledge, many mental qualities, physical or physiological aspects as well as the appearance are also considered. The text says that among other things he should be patient (*dānta*), satisfied with whatever comes to hand (*yaḍṛcchālābhatoṣaka*), controlling his anger (*jitakrodha*), full of devotion (*bhaktimat*). He should not be ill (*sarvarogavivarjita*) or bald (*śipi*), he should not be small but also not too tall (*hrasvākāra, atidīrgha*), and nice and healthy nails (*varjayed devakāryeṣu kunakhi ca viśeṣataḥ*) are also important for someone who is supposed to touch the image of god.⁴⁸

Yet another important Pāñcarātriḥa text, elaborately describing the ritual, namely the *Pādmāsāṃhitā* in chapter 17 of its *caryāpāda*, entitled “the rule [concerning] renovation and consecration” (*jīrṇod-dhārasamprokṣaṇavidhi*), also includes the description of the process of renovation, though it is less detailed. It, for example, forbids the removal of images that could still be repaired (*samādhātavya*), but if they are devoid of limbs (*hīnāṅga*), they should be thrown away and new ones should be created (*hitvā tāni punaḥ sṛjet*). Even if only some repairs are to be done, the god’s potency should be invoked away into a *kumbha* vessel and after renovation and finishing preparatory acts, one should undertake installation.⁴⁹ An image made of metal which is to be thrown away should be melted down and only then one can create a new one. If the image of god is damaged, during the process of

The ViṣvS continues the topic in verses 36.54–92.

⁴⁸ ViṣvS 36.93–117ab.

⁴⁹ PādS cp 17.15:

*kumbhe śaktiṃ samāvāhya nirmāya ca yathāpuram |
adhivāsādikam sarvaṃ pratiṣṭhāyām ivācaret ||*

“Having invoked the [god’s] potency into the *kumbha* vessel and after making [repairs] as previously, one should undertake all preliminary acts etc. as during the installation.”

recreation of a new one, the goddesses previously accompanying him should be united with him again and there is no need to create new idols of the goddesses.⁵⁰ If parts such as a halo, pedestal and other elements of the image or attributes such as the *cakra* are weak, not very solid and unstable/moveable, the image should not be worshipped unless repaired. In such a case the potency of the [subsidiary] image should also be removed to the main image or into the vessel.⁵¹ The old pedestal can serve for the installation of the new image or, if it is also damaged, a new one is to be used.⁵² A provisional, small temple (*bālālaya*)

⁵⁰ PādS cp 17.7–8ab:

tyaktaṃ ca lohajaṃ bimbaṃ dāvayitvā punaḥ sṛjet |
deve jīrṇe punaḥsṛṣṭau devyaḥ prācya yathāsthitāḥ || 17.7
tābhīr eva punar yojyo devo nānyāḥ sṛjet punaḥ | 17.8ab

“One, having melted down the metal image to be thrown away, should then recreate it.

If the damaged [image of] God is recreated, if there were accompanying goddesses previously established, with them again the God should be united; other ones should not be created.”

⁵¹ PādS cp 17.9–10abc:

prabhāpadmāsanāḍṇāṃ vaikalye calane `pi vā |
āyudhe `pi ca cakrādau yaṣṭavyo nāsamāhitāḥ || 17.9
udvāsya pratimāśaktiṃ mūlabere ghaṭe `pi vā |
cakrādeś ca samādhānaṃ kāryaṃ | 17.10c

“If the halo, lotus [-like] pedestal and others are imperfect or even movable and if the weapon, discus and other [attributes are damaged], one should not worship an imperfect [idol]. After removal of the potency of the idol into the main idol or even into a vessel, one should undertake repair to the discus and other [attributes].”

⁵² PādS cp 17.11cd–13:

bimbe purātane jīrṇe navabimbaṃ kṛtaṃ yadi || 17.11
taṃ pīṭhe sthāpayed devaṃ na doṣaḥ padmasambhava |
pīṭhe `py anūtane jīrṇe navaṃ kṛtvā yathāpuram || 17.12
tadbimbaṃ sthāpayet pīṭhe pratiṣṭhākarmabhiḥ sadā |
na doṣaḥ tatra vijñeyaḥ prabhāḍṇāṃ caturmukha || 17.13

“If the idol is damaged and old and when the new one is prepared, then [the image of] the god should be placed on the pedestal. By [doing] this

should be prepared and there the power from the damaged idol should be invoked into the new image. The priest should suspend offerings to Viṣṇu and the old, damaged idol should be buried in the earth or thrown into the water.⁵³

If the temple itself is damaged, the god in his main *mūrti* should be worshipped together with his attendants in the provisional temple. If both the main idol and the temple are destroyed, attending deities should be removed to the main *mūrti*. Less important idols should not be neglected and removed from the temple which is not damaged. When the main idol and the idol for daily offerings (*kautuka*) are destroyed, the other gods should not be removed into another place.⁵⁴

he does not commit an offence, O Lotus-born.

Even if the pedestal is old and destroyed, having made a new one as previously, one should place the image on the pedestal always with [the accompaniment of] the installation ceremony.

Then he does not commit an offence [connected with the usage of the damaged] halo and other [elements], O Four-faced."

⁵³ PādS cp 17.14–15ab:

bālālayaṃ kalpayitvā tatra śailādivastuṣu |

bimba tu śaktim āvāhya jīrṇebhyaḥ pūjanaṃ hareḥ || 17.14

tyaktaṃ ca bimbaṃ nikhanet kṣitau vāmbhasi nikṣipet |

"Having constructed a provisional temple of stone or other materials, having invoked the potency from the damaged [figures] to the idol, the worship of Hari one should abandon. He should bury the image in the earth or throw it into the water".

⁵⁴ PādS cp 17.15cd–18ab:

prāsāde cāpi śithile pūjayed bālaveśmani || 17.15

upetaṃ parivāraiḥ svair devaṃ mūle yathā tathā |

ujīrṇe [corr.; ujīrṇe ed.] dhruvabimbe tu jīrṇe dhāmani ca sthitān || 17.16

devān devaparivārān mūlabere niveśayet |

ajīrṇadhāmaniṣṭhānāṃ jīrṇe tu dhruvakautuke || 17.17

nodvāso 'nyatra kartavyo devāḍṭināṃ caturmukha |

"If the temple is damaged, one should worship in the provisional dwelling the God in the main form together with his companions, according to possibilities.

If the main image is destroyed and the building,

The text says also, that the fruit of both ceremonies, namely the first installation and the re-installation of the renovated idol is the same, and this applies also to the renovation of the temple and other elements. If during the ceremony improper texts are used, the agents of the ritual acts are improper as well as the idols themselves, it will bring destruction of subjects, their king and kingdom.⁵⁵ At the time of installation of several images after their renovation, the same procedures are applied. The sacrificial idol⁵⁶ is placed on the altar (*vedi*) or in the pavilion, but the preliminary acts and bath are not performed, as well as the ceremony of the opening of the eyes of the idol, and the withdrawal and imposition of the *tattva* elements are not needed.⁵⁷ All the acts prescribed in the texts should be duly executed and when the main image is ready, the same, already known procedures should be followed. First the temporary image and the processional idol

one should transfer the deities, God's companions, established [there] into the main image.

When the temple is undamaged but the main image and processional ones are destroyed,
the accompanying gods residing there should not be removed elsewhere,
O Four-faced”.

⁵⁵ PādS cp 17.33cd–35ab:

apūrvakalpane jīrṇe samuddhāre dvayor api || 17.33
tulyaṃ phalaṃ kalpanānāṃ dhāmāder nāsti saṃśayaḥ |
tantrādhikārimūrtināṃ vyatyaye [em. Varada Desikan (ĒFEO, Pondicherry); *vyatyaje* ed.] *kalpite punaḥ || 17.34*
nṛnāṃ narapateś cāpi rāṣṭrasya ca bhavet kṣayaḥ |

“When it is created for the first time and when the destroyed [buildings] are renovated, of both [these activities]
The fruit is the same, [in the case of] the construction of the abode [of God] and others—there is no doubt [about it].
When improper texts, executors and images are used,
it causes the fall of subjects and the king, as well as the kingdom.”

⁵⁶ The term *karmārcā*, which is usually synonymous with *kautukabera*, means a type of image, one of several which are used in the temples. It is meant for offerings. See also TAK vol. II.

⁵⁷ These are the elements of the regular, first installation (*pratiṣṭhā*).

should be honoured and then the potency of god should be invoked into the vessel which is worshipped after placing it on the mould of grains of rice. At a proper time the god's potency should be invoked back into the main idol according to the procedures described in the *sāstras*.⁵⁸

Accompanying deities are placed only in the water of the vessel called *kumbha*. The one acting in such a way brings prosperity to all.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ PādS cp 17.35cd–39:

bahuberapraṭiṣṭhāyām jīrṇoddhāre yathāpuram || 17.35
karmārcām sthāpayed vedyām śāyayec cāpi maṇḍape |
nādhivāso jale kāryo na netronmīlanam tathā || 17.36
na tattvasaṃhārotpāḍau sarvaṃ karmāny athācaret |
mūlabimbaṃ samāsāḍya prāgval sarvaṃ samācaret || 17.37
bālakautukam abhyarcya yātrāmūrtiś ca [ms M₁; yātrāmanyatra ed.]
tadgatām |
śaktiṃ kumbhe samāvāhya kumbhaṃ dhānyasthitam punaḥ || 17.38
abhyarcya samaye prāpte mūlabere guruḥ svayam |
śaktiṃ niveśayec chāstradṛṣṭena vidhinā harau || 17.39

“During the installation of many images and during renovation as previously the image [which in the meantime] is worshipped, should be installed on the altar and laid down in the pavilion.

The preliminary ceremony is not needed, neither a bath, nor [the ceremony of] eyes' opening,

or [the ceremony] of removal and [subsequent] imposition of elements *tattva*. One should perform all the [prescribed] acts.

When one has the main image made, one should execute everything as previously.

Having worshipped the provisional image for daily offerings as well as the processional image,

having invoked the potency [residing there] into a *kumbha* vessel, then this *kumbha*, placed on the [pile of] grains,

having been worshipped [by him], when the [right] time comes, into the main image the teacher himself

transfers the potency into Hari, according to the rule of the *sāstra*.”

⁵⁹ PādS cp 17.40:

kumbhatoyāv aśeṣeṇa parivāraprakalpanam |
utsavaṃ kārayed ante sarvaśāntikaro hi saḥ ||

“One should place all accompanying deities in the water of

Yet another Pāñcarātrika text, with Keralan affiliation, the *Viṣṇu-saṃhitā*,⁶⁰ refers elaborately to the renovation ceremony. In its chapter 24 (24.3) the text compares the renovation of the idols and the god's change of place of residence with the act of abandoning the body by the soul:

*dehaṃ dehī yathā jīrṇaṃ tyaktvā dehāntaraṃ vrajet |
tyaktvā jīrṇaṃ tathā bimbaṃ devo 'pi bhajate navam ||*

"Same as the dweller of the body, abandoning the old one, heading towards the other [new] one,
in the same way, disusing the old image, God assumes the new one."

In the further part of the same 24th chapter of the *ViṣṇuS* one can find a relatively detailed description of the technique of the renovation of the idol, beginning with the removal of the old one⁶¹:

"Accompanied by the priests, who follow him, the teacher himself removes the bindings of the pedestal⁶² with a golden and clean plough, while [reciting] an eight-syllable *mantra*. [Treating the idol] as the remnants from the offerings, while lifting [the image, one recites]:

the *kumbha*

[and] finally, one should mandate a festival—he is the one who brings about the prosperity for all."

⁶⁰ See for example Sarma (forthcoming).

⁶¹ The description in the *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* can be compared with Keralan texts, and the subject was treated by S.A.S. Sarma in his paper entitled "'Re-Installation' of idols replacing damaged ones, with special reference to the ritual literature of Kerala", presented at the *International Conference Consecration Rituals in South Asia*, 19–20 October 2012, Department of Archaeology and Religious Studies, The Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim (to be published soon). I am grateful to Dr. S.A.S. Sarma [ÉFEO, Pondicherry] for providing me with the text of his unpublished article.

⁶² In the beginning the pedestal, if it is for example made of clay or cement, is not firm, therefore before the material stiffens, it should be wrapped around, usually with a rope, to keep its shape. After stiffening of the material of which the pedestal has been made, the wrapping should be removed.

‘I am Viṣvaksena.⁶³

”Making [his] thoughts fixed and reciting *bhūr, bhuvah, svah*, the *sādhaka* should take out the idol from the hollow using a device. Reciting Vedic hymns, with music and shouting *jaya* many times, with dance, singing and laughing, one should lead the idol outside. Having covered it up with a delicate new cloths, having executed rituals (*upacāra*),⁶⁴ together with [*mantra*] *gāyatrī*, ended with *praṇavamāntra* and with other [concluding formulas], on the right side [to the south], after heaping up a quadrangle elevation (*sthaṇḍila*) with sand, and after dredging it with sesame seed and *darbha* grass, he should order to lay the idol down there.

Let him purify it with water, let him worship it with perfumes, flowers and other [substances].

Having walked around [it] three times in the direction opposite/reverse to *pradakṣiṇa*, one should dredge [it] with sesame seeds and rice.

Then, having covered [the image] with other delicate cloths and putting [it] on the vehicle/mount *vāhana*

adorned with an umbrella, flag and banners and ornamented with fans, with the accompaniment of exclamations of nobles, one should lead [it] to the river which tends to the sea.

Then, meditating deeply on the four-armed Viṣvaksena [using] his *mantra* ending with [the word] *namas*, one should throw the idol into the water.

The pedestal and the *brahmaśilā* stone should be considered as impure [namely as the remnants from the offering] (*nirmālya*).⁶⁵

⁶³ Viṣvaksena is the one to whom the remnants of the offerings in the temple belong.

⁶⁴ TAK vol. I.

Bibl. Jag

⁶⁵ *Viṣṇusamhitā* 24.36–45ab:

āvartayadbhir ṛtvigbhir ācāryaḥ sahitaḥ svayam |
viṣṇya pīṭhikābandhaṃ sauvarnair lāṅgalaiḥ śubhaiḥ || 24.36
aṣṭākṣareṇa nirmālyaṃ viṣvakseno 'ham uddhare |
iti kṛtvā sthirāṃ buddhiṃ bhūr bhuvah suvar om iti || 24.37
gartād utthāpayed bimbaṃ yantrayogena sādhaḥ |
vedastotraḥ japaḥ tūryair jayaśabdaiḥ ca puṣkalaiḥ || 24.38
ṇṛtagṛhīṭāhāsaiḥ ca tato bimbaṃ nayed bahiḥ |
ahatair vasanaiḥ ślakṣṇaiḥ samantāt pariveṣṭya tu || 24.39
kṛtvopacāraṃ gāyatrīyā praṇavādyantaruddhayaḥ |
dakṣiṇe sthaṇḍilaṃ kṛtvā saikataṃ caturaśrakam || 24.40

The *Viṣṇusamhitā* continues its teaching referring to different types of damages:

“One should get rid of it if the arms of the idol are damaged, if limbs are broken or deformed, one should get rid of it.
If a finger of one arm is broken, or two, one should not throw away the image.
If there are more [damages], one should get rid of it, and also if three [limbs/fingers] are broken.
Even if toe is broken, one [should do] like that, otherwise one should [re-]create it,⁶⁶
or if it [the image] is ruptured, one should get rid of it, as well as if it is broken.
A finger, if damaged should be re-created with gold, or [if] two [fingers are damaged].
If a stone figure or metal one [is damaged], with copper or silver [it should be repaired].
If a weapon is broken, one should always re-create it with gold, if a tiara or earrings [are damaged] and if cloths and other [elements are damaged], one should [re-create them].
If the image was abandoned, as [it happens] in the case of theft, one should undertake
an installation and perform offering; [even if] the pedestal is not damaged, it should not be re-used.
At the conclusion of the offering [one should prepare] fresh and pure substances, a pedestal (*piṇḍika*), water, spikes of crop [or corn]. There are two kinds of pedestals:
a stone one should be buried in a hollow, a wooden one should be burnt in the fire.
One should use jewels and prepare metal, and then should get rid of the clay [form]. One should throw all [the rest] and the clay [form]

tilān vikīrya darbhāṁś ca pratimāṁ tatra śāyayet |
kṣālayet tatra tām toyair gandhapuṣpais ca pūjayet || 24.41
irirapradakṣiṇaṁ kṛtvā satilais taṇḍulair kiret |
tato 'nyair vasanair ślakṣṇair ācchādyāropya vāhanam || 24.42
chatradhvajapatākābhiś cāmaraiś copaśobhitam |
mahājanaravair yuktaṁ nadīm sāgaragām nayet || 24.43
tatrāgādhe tato dhyātvā viṣvakṣenaṁ caturbhujam |
tanmantreṇa namo 'ntena bimbam apsu viniṣipet || 24.44
pīṭhaṁ brahmaśilāṁ cāpi nirmālyam iti cintayet |

⁶⁶ It can be replaced or covered with metal.

into the water.

If the image of God is broken, in the place where the temple is seen one should prepare another gold image.

One should worship according to the rule a metal [image] or [that made] of jewels, which was first installed [consecrated],⁶⁷

The above presented selected descriptions of the renovation of images and temples are usually detailed, though devoid of all technicalities connected with the production of the material objects, which is the domain of technical manuals on art and architecture. The thorough treatment of the topic indicates the importance and value of the acts which are connected with the re-creation of material objects but at the same time have a religious and ritualistic dimension. Therefore, similarly as in the case of the first installation and consecration ceremonies, they cannot be neglected and executed cursory and by those who are not properly prepared and entitled. The temples in which god resides and images in which he is present cannot be abandoned even if, with a passage of time, some damages should appear in them. It would be careless and dangerous to leave god's potencies in the places which do not fulfill all requirements determined by the texts, because they could get out of control of the entitled specialists and could bring disaster to the whole community related to the temple.

As observed in the above-mentioned passages from the Pāñcarātrika sources, the whole topic is usually structured according to the main issues, which are: the causes of the damage as well as of polluting, differences in the treatment of various images according to their origin and material they are created of; the ways of purifying, or, if needed, renovation or even replacement of the images. In these passages one learns also about dangers and calamities brought by particular kinds of deficiencies in images and god's abodes. Therefore, apart from

⁶⁷ *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* 24.61–70:

bāhucchede parityāgaḥ pratimāyāḥ kare tathā |
yasminn avayave bhagne vairūpyaṃ tatra tām tyajet || 24.61
yady ekakaraśākhā tu bhagnā dve vātra na tyajet |
atahparaṃ parityāgas tricchede kauścid iṣyate || 24.62

technicalities connected with the replacement of one object by another, more general information concerning the religious context is provided. The topic of renovation is important from the point of view of the temple cult, and especially with regard to the specific way of treating god's images in the Tantric traditions, among them Pāñcarātra. The strong belief in the real presence of god in his representations is one of the specific and crucial features which determine the peculiarity and identity of the tradition. It is Pāñcarātra, dominating the temple life of the Vaiṣṇavas in many regions of South India and especially Tamilnadu, which developed the concept of god's presence in his representations (*arcāvatāra*) and made it an indispensable element of the doctrine.⁶⁸

Positioning the process of the construction and, if needed, re-construction of the temple in the context of an elaborate ritual enabling its functioning as a house of god gave this construction a special value. Supporting the physical, material installation of god's idol in the temple with additional group of elaborate ritualistic acts also underlined

pādaśākhāparicchede 'py evam anyatra kalpayet |
sphuṭite ca parityāgo bhinne ca parikīrtitaḥ || 24.63
sauvarṇīm sāṅgulīḥ kāryā yā bhagnā dve ca te tathā |
lohādau cecchilābimbe tāmreṇa rajatena vā || 24.64
heticchede tu sarvatra sauvarṇam tat prakalpayet |
makuṭe kuṇḍale caiva vastrādiṣu ca śasyate || 24.65
pratimāyāḥ parityāge corāhṛtivad iṣyate |
sthāpanam pūjanam cātra na grāhyam pīṭham akṣatam || 24.66
anuyāge navāny eva dravyāṇi śubhadāni tu |
piṇḍikāpacchilādīni dvayoḥ pīṭham tu garhyate || 24.67
gahane nikhanecchailaṃ dāravam vahninā dahet |
dadyād ratnaṃ ca lohaṃ ca kuryād vidrāvya vā punaḥ || 24.68
pārthivam nikṣiped apsu sarvaṃ pārthivam eva vā |
bhagne bimbe 'pi devasya prāsādo yatra lakṣyate || 24.69
tatrāpi kārayed bimbaṃ sauvarṇam aparaṃ punaḥ |
lohajaṃ ratnajaṃ vāgre sthāpitam vidhinārcayet || 24.70

⁶⁸ I referred to this issue as seen in the Pāñcarātra tradition as well as the Śrīvaiṣṇava and other Tantric traditions in my paper and article "At the crossroads of art and religion—image consecration in the Pāñcarātrika sources" (Czerniak-Drożdżowicz forthcoming).

the extraordinary features and uniqueness of such representation. In the case of the South Indian Vaiṣṇava tradition, this uniqueness was understood and properly guarded by the Vaikhānasas and Pāñcarātrikas and that enabled them to establish a firm position of the officiating priests in the most of Vaiṣṇava temples in the South of India, especially in Tamilnadu. It also helped them to face the objections⁶⁹ of the unquestioned orthodox Brahmanical (Smārta) communities.

The material found in the Pāñcarātrika texts is supplementary to the descriptions known from the earlier literature of the *vedāṅga*, *śilpa*- and *vāstuśāstras* as well as *purāṇas* and in the case of the centres of the Vaiṣṇava tradition these texts were and are indispensable sources of the theoretical and practical knowledge about the treatment and management of the temple and idols, also those which got damaged or broken.⁷⁰

Bibliography:

Sanskrit Sources:

Īśvarasaṃhitā. Prativādidbhayaṅkarānantācāryaiḥ saṃśodhitā. (Śāstramuktāvalī 45). Kāñcī 1923.

⁶⁹ I mean here for example the issue of the authoritativeness of the Pāñcarātra, sometimes questioned by the orthodoxy. It was expressed in the discussion taking place for several centuries and having its source in the *Brahmasūtra*, then commentaries of Śaṅkara and the response in defense of the Pāñcarātra which can be found in the works of Yāmunācārya, Rāmānuja and Vedānta Deśika.

⁷⁰ D. Smith wrote in his Foreword to the edition of the *Pāñcarātraprāsāda-prasādhana* (p. XIX): “In comparing the two temple-building traditions—that of the *śilpaśāstra* technical handbooks and that of the *Pāñcarātrāgama* liturgical texts—while in the one the main attention is given over to measurements and technical directions to be used by artisans, in the other the building-activities are discussed mainly in terms of holy rituals performed by an officiating priest-foreman [*ācārya*].”

Īśvarasamhitā. Critically edited and translated in Five Volumes by Lakshmi Tathacharya. Introduction by V. Varadachari and G. C. Tripathi. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 2009.

Jayākhyasamhitā. Crit. Ed. with an Introduction in Sanskrit, Indices etc. by Embar Krishnamacharya. (*Gaekwad's Oriental Series* 54). Baroda 1931.

Nārādīyasamhitā: Nārādīya Samhitā. Ed. by Rāghava Prasāda Chaudhary. (*Kendriya Sanskrita Vidyapeetha Series* 15). Tirupati 1971.

Pāḍmasamhitā (PādS). (Part I). Crit. Ed. by Seetha Padmanabhan and R. N. Sampath. (Part II). Crit. Ed. by Seetha Padmanabhan and V. Varadachari. Madras: Pāñcarātra Pariśodhana Pariṣad 1974, 1982.

Pāñcarātraprāsādaprasādhanam, Chapters 1–10, the kriyāpāda, Pāḍma-samhitā. Ed. and annotated by H. D. Smith, with an Introduction in Sanskrit by Śrī T. S. M. Varadarājabhaṭṭar, Chief-Arcaka, Śrī Varadarājaswamy Temple. Kāñcīpuram. Madras 1963.

Paramasamhitā [of the Pāñcharātra]. Ed. and Translated into English with an Introduction by S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar. (*Gaekwad's Oriental Series* 86). Baroda 1940.

Paramasamhitā. Ms 62.045 (10.G.27). Theosophical Society, Adyar.

Pārameśvarasamhitā: Śrīpāñarātrāntargatā Śrīpārameśvarasamhitā. Śrī Govindācāryaiḥ saṃskṛtā. Śrīraṅgam 1953.

Pauṣkarasamhitā: Pauṣkara-Samhitā. Vol. 1 Critically ed. by Prabhakar Pandurang Apte. (*Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati Series* 54) Tirupati 1991; Vol. 2 Critically ed. and translated into English by Prabhakar Pandurang Apte. Tirupati 2006.

Sātvatasamhitā: Sātvata-Samhitā. With Comment[a]ry by Alaśiṅga Bhaṭṭa. Foreword by Gaurinath Sastri. Ed. by Vraja Vallabha Dwivedi. (*Library Rare Texts Publication Series* 6). Varanasi 1982.

Śrīpraśnasamhitā: Śrīpraśna Samhitā. Ed. by Seetha Padmanabhan with the Foreword of V. Raghavan. (*Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series* 12). Tirupati 1969.

Viṣṇusamhitā. Ed. by M. M. Gaṇapati Sāstrī with an Elaborate Introduction by N. P. Unni. (*Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* 85). Revised & Enlarged Edition. Delhi 1991.

Viṣvaksenasamhitā: Viṣvaksena Samhitā. Crit. ed. by Lakṣmi Narasimha Bhatta. (*Kendriya Sanskrita Vidyapeetha Series* 17). Tirupati 1972.

Secondary sources:

Bhatta, L., K. H. Puranik and H. Rangarajan. 2005. *Āgama Suṣamā. Glimpses of the National Seminar on Āgamas*. Tirupati: Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha.

Banerjea, J. N. 2002. *The Development of Hindu Iconography*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. (Fifth edition).

Bhattacharya, N. S. P. 2005. Consecration of different deities based on Śrī Vaikhāṇasa Āgama. In: L. Bhatta, K. H. Puranik and H. Rangarajan. 2005. *Āgama Suṣamā. Glimpses of the National Seminar on Āgamas*. Tirupati: Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha: 83–98.

Branfoot, C. 2013. Remaking the past: Tamil sacred landscape and temple renovations. In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. University of London vol. 76 no 1: 21–47.

Brunner-Lachaux, H. 1963–1998. *Somaśambhupaddhati. Texte, Traduction et Notes*. 4 vols. (*PIFI* 25.1–4). Pondicherry.

Colas, G. 1986. *Le Temple selon Marīci*. Pondichery: Publications de l'Institut Français d'Inologie.

Colas, G. 1996. *Viṣṇu, ses images et ses feux. Les métamorphoses du dieu chez les vaikhāṇasa*. Paris: Presses de l'École française d'Extrême Orient.

Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. 2003. *Pāñcarātra Scripture in the Process of Change. A Study of the Paramasamhitā*. Publications of The De Nobili Research Library. Ed. Gerhard Obrehammer and Utz Podzeit. Vol. XXXI. Vienna.

Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. 2007. Review article: S. Einoo and J. Takashima (Eds): *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*. Japanese Studies on South Asia nr 4. New Delhi, Manohar Publishers 2005. In: *Indo-Iranian Journal*. Groningen. Vol. 50, issue 3: 297-303

Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. 2008. *Studia nad pañcaratṛą. Tradycja i współczesność*. Kraków: WUJ.

- Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. 2011. *Studia nad pañcaratṛq, Część II. W poszukiwaniu tożsamości*. Kraków: WUJ.
- Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. 2013. The *Pratiṣṭhā* Ceremony (Installation of an Idol) in Some Pāñcarātrika Sources. In: D. Stasik and A. Trynkowska (Eds). *CEENIS Current Research Series* vol. 1. Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa: 149–157.
- Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. forthcoming. At the crossroad of art and religion—image consecration in the Pāñcarātrika sources. Paper presented at the International Seminar *Consecration Rituals in South Asia*. Department of Archaeology and Religious Studies, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway, 18.10.2012–20.10.2012.
- Dagens, B. 1995. *Mayamata. An Indian Treatise on Housing Architecture and Iconography*. English translation. New Delhi: Sitaram Bhartia Institute of Science and Research.
- Davis, R. H. 1999. *Lives of Indian images*. Princeton University Press.
- Davis, R. H. 2000. *Ritual in an Oscillating Universe. Worshiping Śiva in Medieval India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Einoo, S. 2005. Notes on the Installation Ceremonies described in the *Gṛhyapariśiṣṭas*. In: S. Einoo and J. Takashima (Eds). *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers: 95–113.
- Einoo, S. and J. Takashima (Eds). 2005. *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Fuller, C. J. 2004. The renovation ritual in a south Indian temple: the 1995 *kumbhābhīṣeka* in the Minākṣī temple, Madurai. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 67 (1): 40–63.
- Hikita, H. 2005. Consecration of Divine Images in the Temple. In: S. Einoo and J. Takashima (Eds). *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers: 143–197.
- Narasimhan, L. K. K. C. 2005. Renovation and Consecration of Temples and Icons (*Jīrṇoddhāraṇa/Navikaraṇa*). In: L. Bhatta, K. H. Puranik and H. Rangarajan. 2005. *Āgama Suśamā. Glimpses of the National Seminar on Āgamas*. Tirupati: Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha: 202–216.

- Narayanan, V. 1984. *Arcāvatāra: On Earth as He Is in Heaven*. In: J. P. Waghorne and N. Cutler (Eds). *Gods of Flesh, Gods of Stone. The Embodiment of Divinity in India*. Chambersburg: Columbia University Press: 53–66.
- Nayar, N. A. 1992. *Poetry as Theology. The Śrīvaiṣṇava Stotra in the Age of Rāmānuja*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rama Bai, E. R. 2005. A Few Technical Aspects in Vaiṣṇava Āgamas. In: L. Bhatta, K. H. Puranik and H. Rangarajan. 2005. *Āgama Suśamā. Glimpses of the National Seminar on Āgamas*. Tirupati: Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha: 217–234.
- Rospatt von, A. 2013. Buddhist strategies of keeping its sacred images and shrines alive: the example of Svayambhu - caitya of Kathmandu. In: D. Park, K. Wangmo, Sh. Cather (Eds). *Art of Merit: Studies in buddhist Art and its Conservation*. London: Courtauld Institute of Art: 275–285.
- Sarma, S. A. S. forthcoming. 'Re-installation' of idols replacing damaged ones, with special referenece to the ritual literature of Kerala. Paper presented at the International Seminar Consecration Rituals in South Asia. Department of Archaeology and Religious Studies, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway, 18.10.2012–20.10.2012.
- Smith, D. H. 1963. See *Pāñcarātraprāsādaprasādhanam*.
- Smith, D. H. and K. K. A. Venkatachari. 1969. *A Sourcebook of Vaiṣṇava Iconography according to pāñcarātrāgama texts*. Madras: Pāñcarātra Pariśodhana Pariṣad.
- Sthapati, V. G. 2002. *Indian Sculpture and Iconography. Forms and Measurements*. English rendering by Sashikala Ananth. Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Society.
- TAK = *Tāntrikābhidhānaśāstra, A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature*. H. Brunner, G. Oberhammer and A. Padoux (Eds). Vol. I. Wien 2000, vol. II Wien 2003, D. Goodall, M. Rastelli (Eds), vol. III Wien 2013: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Takashima, J. 2005. *Pratiṣṭhā* in the Śaiva Āgamas. In: S. Einoo and J. Takashima (Eds). *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers: 115–143.

- Tsuchiyama, Y. 2005. *Abhiṣeka* in the Vedic and post-Vedic Rituals. In: S. Einoo and J. Takashima (Eds). *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers: 51–93.
- Venkatachari, K. K. A. 2005. Pratiṣṭhā Rituals with Special Reference to Pāñcarātra Āgamas. In: L. Bhatta, K. H. Puranik and H. Rangarajan. 2005. *Āgama Suṣamā. Glimpses of the National Seminar on Āgamas*. Tirupati: Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha: 33–41.
- Welbon, G. R. 1984. Mahāsaṃprokṣaṇa 1981. Āgama and Actuality in a Contemporary Temple Renovational. In: *Agama and Silpa. Proceedings of the Seminar held in December 1981*. Bombay: Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute: 69–102.